

Applic. No.: 10/626,955

Amdt. Dated May 24, 2005

Reply to Office action of March 11, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, and 9-10 remain in the application. Claims 1, 4-5, 7, and 9 have been amended. Claims 3 and 8 have been cancelled.

In item 1 on page 2 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1-2 have been rejected as being anticipated by Jeong (US 6,628,566 B2) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In item 2 on page 3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 7 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Pax (US 6,731,548 B2) in view of Jeong under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejections have been noted and claims 1 and 7 have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application.

More specifically, the feature of claim 3 has been added to claim 1 and the feature of claim 8 has been added to claim 7. Since claims 3 and 8 contain allowable subject matter as indicated in item 3 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1

Applic. No.: 10/626,955

Amdt Dated May 24, 2005

Reply to Office action of March 11, 2005

and 7 are now believed to be allowable. Since claim 2 is dependent on claim 1, it is believed to be patentable as well.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's statement in item 3 on page 3 of the above-mentioned Office action that claims 3-6 and 8-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The feature of claim 3 has been added to claim 1. The feature of claim 8 has been added to claim 7. Since claims 4-6 are ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1 and claims 9-10 are dependent on allowable claim 7, they are believed to be allowable in dependent form.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2, 4-7, and 9-10 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to

Applic. No.: 10/626,955

Amdt. Dated May 24, 2005

Reply to Office action of March 11, 2005

the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-
1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Yonghong Chen
For Applicant

Yonghong Chen
Reg. No. 56,150

YC

May 24, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101